



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/441,892	11/17/1999	John S. Hendricks	026880.00011	5151
4372 7590 04/29/2008				
ARENT FOX LLP				
1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 400				
WASHINGTON, DC 20036				
EXAMINER				
SHAH, AMEE A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3625				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/29/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DCIPDocket@arentfox.com

IPMatters@arentfox.com

Patent_Mail@arentfox.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/441,892

Applicant(s)

HENDRICKS ET AL.

Examiner

Amea A. Shah

Art Unit

3625

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 22-33, 42-74 and 89-102 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 22-32, 42-74 and 89-102 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 February 2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/17/08 & 2/21/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 3-19, 22-33, 42-74 and 89-102 are pending in this action.

Specification

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Examiner Note

Examiner cites particular pages, columns, paragraphs and/or line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. §103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. §102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 1, 3-19, 22-24, 27-29, 33, 42-65, 68-70, 74 and 88-97 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffman et al., US 2005/0144133 A1 (hereafter referred to as "Hoffman") in view of Aggarwal et al., US 6,885,000 B1 (hereafter referred to as "Aggarwal") and further in view of Kanevsky et al., US 6,334,109 B1 (hereafter referred to as "Kanevsky").

Referring to claim 1. Hoffman teaches a method for providing electronic commerce using an electronic book comprising displaying an electronic book and presenting associated with the electronic book an identification of a product or service so that the user can purchase, i.e. perform a transaction for, the selected product or service (e.g. ¶¶0190-0192 and 200 – note that the user reads his/her electronic books and that the system can insert graphic images relating to products using the user's history). Hoffman also teaches storing data for each user to record statistical information and using such data, i.e. history, to determine which product images to insert (e.g. ¶¶0168-0174 and 0192).

Hoffman, however, does not teach wherein the performing of the transaction includes receiving an offered price from the user, determining whether to accept the offered price, selectively transmitting an indication, receiving a new offered price from the user and generating a table for the product or service and using that information to select particular advertisements.

Aggarwal teaches a method for providing electronic commerce comprising displaying a product (col. 5, lines 39-47 - note the product is "item A"); presenting identification of a product or service associated with item A (col. 5, lines 47-51, and col. 6, lines 1-8 – note the associated product or service can be "item A and B," "item B" or "item C"); receiving a user's selection of the product or service and a request to purchase the selected product or service (col. 5, lines 45-47 and col. 6, lines 8-9); and performing a transaction to execute the purchase request, wherein the performing step includes: receiving from the user an offered price for the product or service (col. 6, lines 8-9); determining whether to accept the offered price (col. 6, lines 11-16); selectively transmitting an indication of an acceptance of the offered price based upon the determining (col. 6, lines 13-15 and 19-21); and receiving from the user one or more new offered prices if the offered price is not acceptable upon the determining (col. 6, lines 26-34), wherein the determining step includes determining whether to accept the offered price based upon at least one of the following criteria: an amount of the offered price, any available rebates relating to the selected product or service, any available discounts relating to the selected product or service, or a range of acceptable prices for the selected product or service (col. 6, lines 19-34 – note the determination is made based on the offered price and a range of acceptable price based on the user's profile).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of business methods at the time of the invention to combine the known elements of providing an electronic book with purchasable products or services, as taught by Hoffman, with the known elements of having those products be associated with other products and negotiating for the price of the products, as taught by Aggarwal, as each element would have performed the same function in combination as it did separately. One ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the combination of Hoffman and Aggarwal would yield the predictable results of better targeting the advertising of products for the user, thus increasing the probability of a sale.

Kanevsky teaches a method and system for distributing personalized advertisements including generating a database, i.e. a table, for each user to record statistical information, i.e. a product and user history (e.g. col. 10, lines 6-22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of business methods at the time of the invention to include in the commerce method of Hoffman and Aggarwal the ability to store data relating to the product and user and using that information to select particular advertisements to display to the user, as taught by Kanevsky since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to claim 3. Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky teach the method of claim 1, further including: receiving a request from the user for information concerning a particular product or service (Aggarwal, col. 5, line 60 through col. 6, line 8 - note the request is the viewing of details of an item or visiting the page); and displaying information concerning the particular product or

service in response to the request (Aggarwal, col. 6, lines 5-11—note the displayed information is the request to quote a price). One ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the combination of Hoffman and Aggarwal would yield the predictable results of providing more detail to allow the customer to make a better choice, thus increasing the probability of a sale.

Referring to claims 4 and 5. Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky teach the method of claim 1 but does not specifically teach wherein the performing step includes electronically obtaining payment for the product or service and a digital coupon (Aggarwal, col. 6, lines 44-55 - note the electronic payment is the use of a credit card in e-commerce and the coupon is the discount). One ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the combination of Hoffman and Aggarwal would yield the predictable results of obtaining payment, thus allowing the merchant to make a profit or recoup costs from the sale.

Referring to claims 6 and 7. Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky teach the method of claim 1 wherein the performing step includes establishing an electronic communication with a web site for executing the purchase request (Hoffman, e.g. ¶¶0183-0185 – note that the user can access web sites, i.e. launching browsers, as part of the purchase request, thus establishing an electronic communication with a web site for executing the request).

Referring to claim 8. Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky teach the method of claim 1 wherein the presenting step includes displaying an icon identifying the product or service, and the

receiving step includes receiving selection of the icon by the user (Hoffman, ¶0207 and Aggarwal, col. 6, lines 5-18).

Referring to claims 9-13, Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky teach the method of claim 1 wherein the presenting step includes selecting and displaying information, e.g. in the form of advertisements and multimedia, relating to the product or service (Hoffman, e.g. ¶¶0190 and 0207-0209 and Aggarwal, col. 6, lines 5-15). While Hoffman and Aggarwal both teach selecting and displaying information in the form of advertisements and multimedia, it is noted that the form of displaying information is non-functional descriptive material that does not functionally relate to the step of displaying - the information would be displayed in the same manner and for the same purpose regardless of whether the display was in the form of advertisements or multimedia. Thus, the form of display would not patentably distinguish the step of displaying from the prior art.

Referring to claim 14, Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky teach the method of claim 1 wherein the presenting step includes displaying an identification of a digital product and the performing step includes downloading the digital product into a memory associated with the viewer (Hoffman, ¶¶0183-0185).

Referring to claims 15-18, Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky teach the method of claim 1 further including recording statistical information relating to the purchase request and purchases (Hoffman, ¶0189 and Aggarwal, col. 5, lines 1-10).

Referring to claim 19. Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky teach the method of claim 1 further including: receiving from the user a request for display of information concerning a particular product or service (Aggarwal, col. 5, line 60 through col. 6, line 8 - note the request is the viewing of details of an item or visiting the page); displaying information relating to the particular product or service in response to the request (Aggarwal, col. 6, lines 5-11—note the displayed information is the request to quote a price); and displaying information relating to products or services associated with the particular product or service (Aggarwal, col. 5, lines 50-55). One ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the combination of Hoffman and Aggarwal would yield the predictable results of providing more detail to allow the customer to make a better choice, thus increasing the probability of a sale.

Referring to claims 22 and 23. Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky teach the method of claim 1 wherein the performing step includes encrypting the transaction with a digital signature for secure execution of the purchase request (Hoffman, e.g. ¶¶0100-0103).

Referring to claim 24. Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky teach the method of claim 1 wherein: the displaying step includes displaying a hypertext link identifying the product or service; and the receiving step includes receiving selection of the hypertext link (Hoffman, ¶¶0198 and 0207-0209).

Referring to claims 27 and 28. Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky teach the method of claim 1 further including providing a sample of the product using the viewer, e.g. a video clip, an audio clip, a portion of an electronic book, an image, a slide show, or an animation (Hoffman, ¶¶0198-0200 – note the samples are the graphic images associated with a product).

Referring to claims 29 and 33. Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky teach the method of claim 1 further including generating and presenting a customized electronic catalog, including the identification of the product or service and an identification of other products or services, based upon information related to the user (Hoffman, ¶¶0198-0200 and Aggarwal, col. 5, line 45 through col. 6, line 17– note that the catalog is a listing of products).

Referring to claims 42-65, 68-70, 74 and 88-97. All of the limitations in apparatus and method claims 42-65, 68-70, 74 and 88-97 are parallel to the limitations of method claims 1-19, 22-24 and 27-29, discussed above, and are rejected on the same bases.

Claims 25, 26, 66 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky and further in view of Williams et al., US 6,016,484 (hereafter referred to as “Williams”).

Referring to claims 25 and 26. Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky teach the method of claim 1 but not specifically wherein the performing step includes: presenting an electronic order form on the viewer based upon stored information identifying the user and payment information, and receiving a completed and submitted version of the electronic order form for the execution of the

purchase request. In the same field of endeavor and/or pertaining to the same issue, Williams teaches a method and apparatuses for presenting an electronic order form on the viewer; based upon stored information identifying the user and payment information; and receiving a completed and submitted version of the electronic order form for the execution of the purchase request (Fig. 11 and col. 31, lines 28-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of business methods at the time of the invention to combine the known elements of displaying an electronic book with products r services associated with it and allowing for negotiating of prices, as taught by Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky, with the known elements of presenting a order from based upon stored information and receiving a completed form to execute the purchase, as taught by Williams, as each element would have performed the same function in combination as it did separately. One ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the combination of Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky with Williams would yield the predictable results of allowing the customer to know exactly what is being ordered and the amount being paid before submitting, i.e. confirming the order, leading to less customer duplications and higher customer satisfaction.

Referring to claims 66 and 67 – All of the limitations in apparatus claims 66 and 67 are parallel to the limitations of method claims 25 and 26, discussed above, and are rejected on the same bases.

Claims 30-32 and 71-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky and further in view of Yamauchi et al., US 5,613,109 (hereafter referred to as “Yamauchi”).

Referring to claims 30 -32. Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky teach the method of claim 1 wherein the displaying step includes displaying an electronic catalog, as discussed above, but does not specifically teach displaying an interactive electronic catalog within the electronic book as an insert or overlaid image. Yamauchi, in the same field of endeavor and/or pertaining to the same issue, teaches a method and apparatus for inserting advertising within electronic books, such advertising comprising electronic catalogs (see, e.g., Abstract and col. 5, lines 22-42 and col. 19, lines 12-19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of business methods at the time of the invention to combine the known elements of displaying an electronic book with products or services associated with it and allowing for negotiating of prices, as taught by Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky, with the known elements of displaying the products as inserted or overlaying images, as taught by Yamauchi, as each element would have performed the same function in combination as it did separately. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the combination of Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky with Yamauchi would yield the predictable results of increasing the advertising benefits to advertiser of more targeted advertising, better placement and display, thus increasing the possibility of a sale.

Referring to claims 71-73. All of the limitations in apparatus claims 71-73 are parallel to the limitations of method claims 30-32, discussed above, and are rejected on the same bases.

Claims 98-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky and further in view of Bernard et al., US 5,918,213 (hereafter referred to as “Bernard”).

Referring to claim 98. Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky teach the method of claim 1 but do not specifically teach the method further comprising providing an available sample associated with the product or service upon a request from the user before the user requests a purchase of the product or service.

Bernard teaches a system and method for automated remote previewing and purchase of music, video, software and other products whereby purchasers are provided a sample prior to purchasing the product so the customer can evaluate the product prior to purchasing (see, e.g., Abstract and col. 3, lines 19-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of business methods at the time of the invention to include in the commerce method of Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky the ability to provide a sample to purchasers prior to a purchase, as taught by Bernard, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to claims 99-102. All of the limitations in apparatus and method claims 99-102 are parallel to the limitations of method claim 98, discussed above, and are rejected on the same bases.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendment, filed February 4, 2008, have been entered. Claims 1, 25, 26, 42, 67, 68, 89, 93 and 97 have been amended. Claims 98-102 have been added. In response to the replacement drawing sheets, the objections to the drawings are withdrawn. In response to amendments to the claims, the objections regarding renumbering are withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's argument, filed February 4, 2008, regarding the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections have been considered and are found persuasive; the §112 rejections are withdrawn. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 38-42, 89, 93 and 97-102 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by the amendments.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amec A. Shah whose telephone number is (571)272-8116. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Smith can be reached on 571-272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AAS
April 23, 2008

/Yogesh C Garg/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3625